

RCE for Application 10/695,530 July 24, 2006

4

REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application as presently amended is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks.

In the Final action, the Examiner rejected all of Applicant's claims under 35 U.S. C. 102 (b) as being anticipated by Stockburger et al. ("On-Line Hydrogen Generation from Aluminum in an Alkaline Solution". Proc.-Electrochem. Soc. (1992), 92-5 (Proc. Symp. Hydrogen Storage Mater., Batteries, Electrochem., 1991), 431-444, 1992, XP-001032928). This rejection of Applicant's claims using the Stockburger et al. reference remains misunderstood because it diverges from the reasons of allowance of a Primary Examiner in the Applicant's parent application S/N # 09/620,250.

In this Request for Continued Examination, Applicant decided to introduce more specificity in his claims to clearly distinguish his claims from all prior art, including the Stockburger et al. reference.

Arguments in support of Independent Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended to recite the step of forming, as a product of the catalytic reaction, a clean aluminum derivative free of sodium-containing compound. Proper support for Applicant's claim 1 can be found in Applicant's specification, and in particular from page 22, line 15 to page 26, line 9, and page 31, lines 16-17.

Inasmuch as the Examiner might reconsider the Stockburger et al., reference again in a 35 U. S. C. # 102 or # 103 rejection of claim 1, the following comment is submitted. The Stockburger et al. reference discloses that the product from the hydrogen-producing reaction described therein is sodium aluminate $\text{NaAl}(\text{OH})_4$. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is clearly distinct and patentable over the Stockburger et al. document.

It will be appreciated that Applicant's process as described in claim 1 is more efficient than the Stockburger et al. process because the by-product obtained in Applicant's process is more readily transformed into aluminum.

RCE for Application 10/695,530 July 24, 2006

5

Argument in support of Independent Claim 8

Claim 8 is a new claim that contains essentially the same step as in claim 1, but where the catalytic reaction has been characterized by one that transforms water into hydrogen according to a molecular ratio of one to one. Proper support for this limitation can be found in Applicant's specification and in particular in equation (1) on page 12.

Inasmuch as the Examiner might reconsider the Stockburger et al., reference again in a 35 U. S. C. # 102 or # 103 rejection of Applicant's claim 8, the following comment is submitted. The Stockburger et al. reference discloses a reaction where 6 molecules of water are required to produce 3 molecules of hydrogen. Therefore, Applicant's process is twice as efficient as the Stockburger et al. process. Consequently, Applicant's claim 8 should be found to be distinct and patentable over the Stockburger et al. reference.

Argument in support of Independent Claim 9

Claim 9 is a new independent claim that combines the features of claims 1 and 8. Claim 9 recites a catalytic reaction by which high yield hydrogen and clean alumina are obtained. It is respectfully submitted that this claim should be found allowable over the Stockburger et al. reference for substantially the same reasons as those set forth for claims 1 and 8 herein above.

An early indication of allowance of Applicants' claims is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Mario Theriault, P.Eng.
Patent Agent for Applicant
Reg. No. 40,368

Copy to: Mr. Jim Andersen